

THE  
7.  
BIBLE VINDICATED

FROM THE

CHARGE OF SUSTAINING

SLAVERY;

BY

G. BUCKINGHAM.

COLUMBUS.  
PRINTED AT THE TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE OFFICE;

1837.

## THE BIBLE VINDICATED.

---

IN the day of final judgment, every man will be called upon to give an account of the "deeds done in the body," "whether they be good or whether they be evil." It should consequently be the aim of christians, to ascertain their duty on all questions of importance, that there may no "blood be found in their skirts." The duty of the church on the subject of American slavery, is the object of our research in the following pages. It must be determined, by the voice of God, speaking to us through Divine revelation. That is the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and by it we are always perfectly safe in governing our lives. That the bible both justifies and furnishes rules to regulate servitude, we do not wish to deny. The question to be settled is, was Jewish servitude of such a character as to justify American slavery? There were Hebrew and Gentile servants, distinguished from hired servants: they were "bought with money." Did these persons sell themselves and receive an equivalent for their services? Or were they stolen by others, sold and compelled to involuntary service, without wages? The following passage is doubtless the strongest one afforded by the bible, which slaveholders and their apologists claim to justify the relation of master and slave.

Lev. xxv. 44, 45, 46. "Both thy bondmen and bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about thee; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them for an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever; but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule, one over another with rigor."

We are gravely told, that this text proves, both that the Jews might buy slaves of the heathen and strangers, and perpetuate slavery by transmitting them to their children as property "forever." This proved, they have established a similitude between Jewish servitude and American slavery, sufficient to justify the continuance of the latter, until some plan is spread before the public, wiser and better in the opinions of our opponents than immediate repentance. If this be not the object of those who TROUBLE the bible, what can be? (Abolitionists would never have disturbed the question of Jewish servitude, unless pro-slavery men had attempted to prop themselves in iniquity by declaring it the same in principle with American slavery.)

We are, however, quite unwilling to believe their assertion, and therefore say, slavery is always sin. It is denied, and the bible is called up to develop a system of **SLAVERY**, which has calmly reposed in the tomb for eighteen hundred years. A simple comparison between the legal treatment of Jewish servants and American slaves, would be sufficient to cover the holders of the latter with everlasting infamy, and should summon the "mantling blushes" of deepest shame to the cheeks of slaveholders and their apologists. But we intend to do more—"to carry the war into the enemy's camp;" and prove not only that there was no slavery on Jewish soil, but that American slavery, in the light of the word of eternal truth, is most detestable; and must "forever" suffer under the withering anathemas and anger of Almighty God.

We lay down as our hypothesis, *sustained by the text alluded to* and "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," the following propositions.

I. The Jews were not allowed in any case to buy, either the heathen or strangers, who had been reduced to slavery; by which we mean involuntary bondage, without crime.

II. They could not hold a man as property at all, much less establish *everlasting slavery*.

III. Heirs could not claim services from servants of legators, except upon contracts limited by the Jubilee.

IV. Servants were in the main treated as children or equals; no authority appearing in the bible, for using them as are our Southern slaves.

These are startling positions to those who believe that slavery is not always wrong. And we confess our diffidence in asserting them, when we know how many *great names* are opposed to us. Before we proceed to the proof, however, let us inquire, What is a slave? In the language of the Roman law, (when our Saviour was on the earth,) a slave was one "without name," and counted "pro nullis, pro mortuis, pro quadrupedibus;" that is, "for nobody, for dead, for four footed beasts." In the language of the Louisiana law, "a slave is one who is in the power of his master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry and his labor; he can do nothing, acquire nothing, but what must belong to his master." The South Carolina law adjudges slaves to be "chattels personal in the hands of their owners, possessors and assignees, to all intents, purposes and constructions whatever," and this is said to be "forever." In all the States he may be sold at the will of his master. Such an one is a *slave*. With voluntary servitude, or the servitude of minors, we wage no opposition, assured that the danger to be apprehended from them, is both small and remote. Slavery, involuntary servitude, interminable bondage, labor without compensation, "reaping down fields and wages kept back by fraud," invasion of the marriage rights, destruction of the family relation, mental degradation, hopeless ignorance, heathenizing entailing of religious privileges, chastity annihilating systems, are what we hate, for God hath taught us thus. We attempt not to prove there was no protracted servitude, among the Jews—not that master is

an unholy title, not that a man may not buy or sell services, not that one man should not serve another in a menial relation; but that God did in holy anger, fulminate death the portion of any and every one who held his fellow man a *slave* in the common sense of that term. But to proceed with the subject.

First. The Jews could not in any case, buy either the heathen or strangers, who had been reduced to involuntary bondage without crime.

The moral law of God is, in all its bearings, like its glorious Author, immutable everlasting. Not one of its provisions has ever been changed. Men should therefore be exceedingly cautious, how they make assertions, which conflict with either the letter or spirit of that law; for Christ says, Math. v. 17, 18, 19, "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the *least in the kingdom of Heaven*: but whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called *great in the kingdom of Heaven*." One of those enactments, concerning which he spake thus, was delivered by Jehovah amid the awful solemnities of thundering and darkness upon Mount Sinai, and reads thus: "And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death." Ex. xxi. 16. Apply this to America—enforce its provisions, and how soon would every slaveholder "open the prison doors to them that are bound," and "let the oppressed go free?" Because every slave in the land is either a *stolen* man or, what is no better, his descendant. "Men stealers! The worst of all thieves; in comparison of whom highway robbers and housebreakers are innocent; and *men buyers* are exactly on a level with *men stealers*."—John Wesley. If the first stealing be morally wrong, all the logic in the world can never render *just* the sale of stolen men or their descendants, though repeated through a succession of ages, sufficient to exhaust our knowledge of numbers. This law was promulgated immediately subsequent to the exhibition of a succession of stupendous miracles, revealing the illimitable majesty of Almighty God; all performed for the deliverance of his chosen people from an oppressive bondage. As it is of vast importance, and will be again referred to in the prosecution of our subject, let us ascertain the extent of its meaning, that we may not err in its application. And to do this correctly, we must find a scriptural instance of *man stealing*, to know precisely what is condemned. In Genesis, xl. 15, we learn that Joseph was *stolen*; and by comparing the manner in which he was reduced to slavery, with that process which crowds the "middle passage" between Africa and America with its miserable victims, we may without the possibility of erring, discover the applicability of the law, (Ex. xxi. 16,) to the system of American slavery. And,

1. Joseph was forcibly taken prisoner by his brethren—1. So are Africans.
2. Joseph was sold to slavery—2. So are Africans.
3. Joseph was carried into a foreign land by the mercenary wretches

who bought him, and sold to Potiphar—3. So are Africans carried into a foreign land, and sold to the Potiphars of Christian America.

The analogy is complete—both are alike condemned. This “infernal traffic in human flesh” has continued with us two hundred years. Yet, though Joseph says he was stolen—and the bible threatens death to men stealers—and American slaves are made such in the identical manner he was, there are found some followers of Jesus, who say slavery is not sin; that the great Southern *Market-house* for “souls of men” is a *holy temple*, and its keepers are the *sacred depository of the Holy Ghost*!!

O slavery, what hast thou done! Do not, we beseech you dear brethren, accuse the Holy One of describing *stealing men* (Joseph interpreting) on one page of his blessed book, on the second fixing death as its just reward, and on the third dictating to Moses a perpetual charter for the commission of that very crime. Never was a law more plainly opposed to an iniquitous practice, than was this of Jehovah against slavery—and it applies, in its unchangeable nature, with unabated force to American slavery.

There are but two modes of reducing men to slavery—(involuntary bondage without crime.) The first is stealing them, as Joseph was, which we have described, and it is not only condemned by the bible, Ex. xxi. 16, but is declared piracy by the laws of every christian nation, with a single exception. The second is, by compelling to unrequited toil, through legal and physical force, on the soil of one’s birth. And this is as plainly condemned in the bible as the former. Jeremiah xxii. 13, “Wo unto him that useth his neighbor’s service without wages, and giveth him not for his work.” “Rob not the poor because he is poor; neither oppress the afflicted in the gate; for the Lord will plead their cause, and *spoil the soul* of those that spoiled them.” Prov. xxii. 22. Every American slave comes under one of these modes; and so would Jewish *slaves*, had there been any.

Most hateful in the sight of God, is oppression in every form, but particularly so when imposed upon the “stranger,” or “widow or fatherless,” that might “sojourn” in their land; the very class this from which the Jews were to “take their bondmen and bondmaids.” He solemnly and repeatedly warns them against it in the following passages. Deut. xxv. 17, “Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the *stranger*, nor of the *fatherless*,” &c. Ex. xxii. 21, 22, 23, 24. “Thou shalt neither vex a *stranger* nor oppress him. . . . If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry. And my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless.” Levit. xix. 33, 34, “The *stranger* that dwell with you shall be unto you as one born among you and *thou shalt love him as thyself*, for ye were *strangers* in the land of Egypt.” Also, Ex. xxiii. 9, thus urging them to mercy, from a remembrance of their own wrongs, while in bondage. An appeal, the most cogent possible, is this.

The Jews might purchase servants both from the heathen and strangers. The latter were doubtless free from the characteristic word

“sojourner” applied to them in the charter. And the heathen, who were bought for bondmen, must also have been free, else the Jews would be partakers in the iniquity of the *man stealer*. Hebrews were not permitted to steal them, and to buy them of such as had stolen them would be no better. “For he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds,” 2 John. i. 11. If indeed Hebrews could buy men stolen, enslaved against their will, why buy at all? It would be easier and no more criminal to *steal* them themselves, and save money. They had the *power* to *enslave* those “sojourning” among them, and might have done it; but this would have been oppression, and they were forbidden by “ye shall *buy*.” The conviction is irresistible that those “bondmen and bondmaids” whom the Jews “bought with money,” sold themselves (if of age, or were sold by their parents during minority) upon the equitable principles practiced every day by northern freemen.

We here assert as probable, from the different constitution of society, that a much larger proportion of our *free citizens* in the free States, are in servitude, than was among the Jews. Foreigners sold to pay their passage to America, apprentices and laborers agreeing for protracted service—all upon the same basis, value for value, a given amount of labor for a given sum, so many years for what was considered an equivalent.

Again. This service must positively have been voluntary, and not only so but more favorable to the servant than the master; else why so strange a license as the following would prove to every servant in the country: “Thou shalt not deliver to his master the servant which has escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him,” Deut. xxiii. 15, 16. How would slavery vanish away, as the morning cloud before the rising sun, if there stood incorporated in our National Constitution, such a regulation as the foregoing, found embodied in the Jewish *Slave Code*! As the Russian ways were crowded with the self defeated thousands of Napoleons’ army, so would our ways be thronged with flying myriads of Southern slaves.

But it is asserted that the Jews certainly could make slaves of captives taken in their wars with the Canaanites! The *proof* is all against, assertion only in favor of this. Joshua was commanded “to save alive nothing that breatheth”—“thou shalt utterly destroy them,” Joshua ix. 24, and Deut. xx. 16, 17, 18. He was however deceived, and in one instance commuted the righteous sentence of God (death) to servitude. The character of that servitude is clearly set forth in the following passages: 1 Kings ix. 20, 21, Judges i. 23, 29, 35, 2d Samuel viii. 2, 8, 14, by an examination of which we find this relation. A Tribe tributary to the Jews in consideration of certain privileges. The Gibeonites paid this to the Jews in a national capacity, in labor instead of money. “Hewers of wood and drawers of water to the congregation of Israel.” It was the price of their life, and cheaply was the purchase made; for there is not the slightest indication of personal servi-

tude, individual slavery ! The Gibeonites still occupied their own city, doubtless dwelt in their own houses, and preserved inviolate the sanctity of the family relations. As the Canaanites had no good objection to urge against the exterminating anathema of the Almighty, having deserved death by their sins committed against the preaching of Abraham, this arrangement of Joshua's was *tender mercy* instead of oppression. So much for slavery among conquered enemies, claimed by the real pro-slavery of the South, and unwittingly echoed by their apologists in the North. There is one text in the Bible, which approaches justification of slavery, nearer than all others. It is Deut. xxi. 10th, &c. A Hebrew might take a beautiful female captive home and marry her as his lawful wife. If he did not this she was free !!

Once more. That Hebrew servants *sold themselves* is perfectly clear. Lev. xxv. 47, "And if a sojourner, or stranger, wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor, and *sell himself* unto the stranger," &c. he might either be redeemed or serve, just as long as a heathen servant could a Jew, until the Jubilee. Now if a Hebrew servant *sold himself* as a "bondman" for the longest possible period, why is it not more than probable, the Heathen and strangers did the same ? A stranger would not of course have the right to steal or enslave a Hebrew ; that would be wrong. And the Hebrew was both forbidden to do it to one of his brethren and to a stranger ; for he was taught to "love the stranger as himself," Lev. xix. 33, 34. In other words, to do unto a stranger as he would, that a stranger should do unto him. This would effectually preclude the Hebrew from interfering with the rightful freedom of the "heathen and sojourner" in any purchases of services from them. Every description of servants then *sold themselves* into *voluntary servitude* for a specified period, instead of *being sold as slaves* into *perpetual slavery*. Who can with moral rectitude sell freemen but themselves ?

God gave us only over beast, flesh, fowl,  
Dominion absolute ; that right we hold  
By his donation ; but man over men  
He made not lord ; such title to himself  
Reserving, human left to human free.—*Milton.*

What is the object of stealing men ? To enslave them. "And he that stealeth a man, &c. "shows that slavery, involuntary bondage without crime, could not exist on the soil of Palestine."

We will now show in what manner servants might be obtained.

First. A Hebrew might sell himself to a Hebrew, for six years, if reduced to extreme poverty, Lev. xxv. 39; or to a stranger until the Jubilee, Lev. xxv. 47, 50.

Second. A father might sell the services of his daughter during her minority, or to be the wife or daughter in law of the purchaser, Ex. xxi. 7. A custom strange to us in part, but perfectly right and aptly illustrated by the sale of Leah and Rachel, by Laban their father. Gen. xxix. ch.

Third. Thieves might be sold to pay the person injured by their theft, if they had not property sufficient.

Fourth. Children were detained with their mother, where a man obtained his freedom before his wife; but nothing in the law to separate the husband from the remainder of the family, if he chose to remain with them until the Jubilee, Ex. xxi. 4. Some think children could be sold to pay the debts of insolvent parents. This idea is founded upon 2d Kings, iv. 1. But finding not only no "thus saith the Lord," but in my opinion a strong condemnation of the practice of sundering families forcibly without crime, I deny the legality of the procedure, and demand better evidence. Were this true, it would not assist to stand erect the falling pillars of pretended right, upon which reclines the black American Colossus, slavery. Having now enumerated every way described by the bible, in which men might become "servants or bondmen," and none of them coming in conflict with our first position, that "the Jews were not authorized in any case to buy a man reduced to involuntary servitude without crime," we proceed to the second.

II. The Jews could not hold a *man* as *property* at all, much less establish everlasting slavery. And,

1. Three things are always necessary to constitute a fair transfer of property. (1) A seller, (2) a buyer, (3) the thing sold. In every purchase of servants among the Hebrews, the seller was the first, the buyer the second, and the services sold the third. This is true, because we have shown that no involuntary servitude could be tolerated among them, except for crime, theft. How utterly at variance with these truths are American manners! The *soul driver*, the planter, and the poor slave, here form the necessary trio in the transaction of enormous iniquity.

2. Two ideas always attach to property in itself considered, viz: absolute control over it by the owner, unless the superior rights of others are injured by his management; and, the power to transmit, by will or sale, to successive holders. Now, neither of these can be established in reference to Jewish servants, because nearly one half of their time was given them by law, and complete liberty to all every fiftieth year.

3. It is ridiculous to talk of property holding an unrestrainable *right* in property. Though masters in the South, may sometimes grant "pecuniisms" to their slaves, yet their legal right of property in the time, labor, soul and body of the slave, must and does positively absorb all other rights. But servants mentioned in the bible could not only hold property uncontrolled by their masters, but every act of becoming a servant was accompanied by a demand for property, which the buyer must pay to the servant before he could have any kind of claim upon him.

4. *No man has the moral right to sell himself as property.* It is freely granted, that a master had an interest in the services of his bondmen, for he had "bought" them, and they were "his money." So have masters now. Every where they have the same pecuniary interest in the bodies, souls and services of foreigners "bought with money," free laborers and apprentices, which the Jews had in their "servants and bondmen." Yet this interest is far from amounting to property in

the "flesh and blood," and "souls of men." The bodies of all men belong, with their souls and every ransomed power, to God, and him alone. "Every soul is mine, saith the Lord." "The earth is the Lord's, with the fulness thereof," says David and Paul; "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price." Every where that the ownership of man is hinted at in the bible, he is claimed by his Creator. Who else can? God gives him his bodily and mental powers for his own happiness, good, and to glorify his maker. Of course no man is at liberty to impair or oppose this right of God in him, or transfer it to another, as property; for "he is not his own." And no man can rightfully buy such a right unless of God himself; he being the true owner of all men. No man then has the moral right to sell himself, becoming property, thereby throwing off the restraints of the Almighty, and fastening upon himself the shackles of sinful man.

And now we shall show, that even the mild and equitable servitude authorized among the Jews, could not be perpetuated. And,

1. Six years in every case, closed the services of a Hebrew to a Hebrew; or forty-nine at the utmost, a Hebrew to a stranger, Lev. xxv. 47, 50.—Jeremiah xxxiv. 13, 14. "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel; I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them forth, out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen, saying; at the end of seven years, let ye go every man his brother a Hebrew which *has been sold unto thee*; and when he hath served thee *six years*, thou shalt let him go free from thee," Here the reader will perceive the same phraze is used in reference to a Hebrew, as in the case of a heathen, "has been sold unto thee;" but nothing is more clear than that *services* alone were sold *for a limited season or period*. Our opponents do not, *cannot* resist the plainness of this proof, but say the heathen! and strangers! were certainly to be *slaves "forever."* If they could be equally candid in reference to the heathen and the Jew, there exists in the bible just as good proof, that periodical liberty, was offered to the former, as the latter. It is found, Levit. xxv. 9, 10. "Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound, on the tenth day of the seventh month; in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet to sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all your land, unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a Jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family." Not an individual excepted, heathen nor Jew, "liberty to all the inhabitants of the land." This law was fundamental. While Ex. xxi. 16, fenced slavery out of Judea, Levit. xxv. 9, 10, prevented abuses of the privilege granted, Lev. xxv. 44, 45, 46; and while the Jubilee was preserved, perpetuity of servitude was completely prevented. It was wise, glorious and important. Primarily typical of the liberty, proclaimed by Christ and his apostles, after the grand atonement had been made, by the Saviour "bearing our sins in his own body on the tree." This is clear from the analogy between the two. When the Jubilee trump was sounded, liberty was offered to all. So when Jesus had died, had finished the atonement, and "ascending

on high led captivity captive," and had crowned his apostles with pentecostal fire, liberty from sin, through faith, the benefit of his death, was offered to all who would accept. Again: The trump was to sound "on the tenth day of the seventh month," the day when atonement was to be made by the high priest for the sins of the people, which is acknowledged by all to be the very manifest type of Christ's death and atonement for the spiritual bondage of the "whole world." Thus the Jewish atonement typified the death of the Saviour; and the Jubilee most beautifully adumbrated the proclamation of "glad tidings which shall be to all people." Mr Parkhurst says, "It is a lively prefiguration of the grand consummation of time, which will be introduced in like manner by the trump of God, 1 Cor. xv. 52," when the graves shall burst in the general resurrection. Now, how could the Jubilee be typical of this liberty offered in Christ to all, or that granted positively to all the dead in the "glorious morn," unless "every inhabitant in the land" was entitled to freedom from servitude? Both the typical character of the Jubilee, and the plain language of the text, rivet the true impression upon the mind, "*there was no perpetual servitude among God's chosen people.*

But we are told by sticklers for slavery, that the text says of the heathen and strangers, they shall be your bondmen "forever." Let us see how much "forever" is. Unless this term be applied to an individual servant, it does our opponents no good. For if applied to the *system* of buying servants from the heathen, whatever might be the length of service, it would bring no revenue to the argument for perpetual bondage; the Jubilee interrupting the *servitude*, but not affecting the *system*. But it could not apply to individuals (though from the manner the passage is translated, such at first sight appears to be its design) first, because it contradicts fact, viz: the life of the individual could not continue "forever." Second: A positive law comes in conflict with this application, viz: the Jubilee, declaring all contracts for servitude at an end. But again: Apply this term "forever," (which every biblical scholar knows to be often a limited one, sometimes applying to things temporal, sometimes eternal,) to an individual, and the period indicated by it was either closed at the Jubilee, or the plain text of that institution, "*all* the inhabitants of the land," only meant "*a part of* the inhabitants of the land." Let the term "forever" refer to the *system* of purchasing "bondmen and bondmaids" from the "heathen and stranger," (as in fact it really does); and the word of God is reconciled with itself, which in this case can be done in no other way. The apparent disrepancy between Leviticus, xxv. 10, and the 46th verse of the same chapter, vanishes.

Again: The term "forever" is usually applied to things of considerable duration, so much so as to give an idea of perpetuity. It may relate, in perfect accordance with this sense, to the *system* of servitude, but cannot to individuals. We give a different reading to the text, to show our idea in addition to what has been said.

*Common translation.**Paraphrase.*

“And ye shall take them for an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession: they shall be your bondmen forever.”

“And ye shall” forever continue to “take them for an inheritance, &c. and *they*” not your brethren the *Hebrews* “shall forever be your bondmen.”

“The passage seems to mean,” says an able writer, “that the Hebrews might by successive purchase, continually possess that kind of servants, and not, that they might hold the same individuals for life.” We once more assert the fact, that no contract for service could be valid beyond the Jubilee—supported in this view by the positive “*all*” before noticed, as superior in its weight, to the accommodating term “*forever*.” There is no real force in this phrase, so much harped upon by those who would even fasten upon the Holy One, the charge of sanctioning slavery in his moral law, if they could thereby abolish abolitionism. (Let those only clothe themselves with this *garment*, who are fitted by it.)

One more argument in favor of the first member of our second head.

5. The position that God allows men to be enslaved, we think presents him in a most unenviable predicament of inconsistency, which we know is impossible in fact. By his law he demands our undivided service; and this charge would make it appear, that he had resigned a part of that right to the task master or slave owner. God would not invest, we think, *nay has not* invested, an arm wielded by a wicked heart, with unlimited and despotic sway, over his fellow man. No never! for He is wisdom and love and mercy. That the pecuniary interest of the master comes in contact with the religious duty of the slave in innumerable instances, is a fact so notorious, that it requires no proof. As a consequence of this, an accredited correspondent of the “*Presbyterian*,” writing from Alabama, declares them “emphatically a neglected race;” and the Kentucky and Tennessee divines, have recently attested to the almost universal denial of religious privileges to the slaves, though they have the same right to the instructions of the sanctuary, with whites, and their souls require the light of divine truth to prepare them for the great day of accounts, just as much, yea more than do those of the whites. This state of neglect is very general; and how absolutely irreconcileable with probability, is the idea of “goods and chattels” prescribing religious liberty, as a condition of continued service! Property dictating to its owner. No. A *slave* has no acknowledged civil or religious rights. God would not found an institution, investing the control of an owner in one man, and imposing the subserviency of property on another, as from the natural laws of the human mind, it would produce results so disastrous to morals, as above described, and that too so general, and *unavoidable by the best legal control in existence*. No man, in the light of the word of God, would throw away his dearest rights, because it involves palpable sin; they must be torn from him by the hands of ruthless oppressors. The very relation of master and slave, instituted for gain, pleasure or profit, is sin, only sin, always sin in itself.

6. It is objected that the phrase "of them shall ye buy your bondmen and bondmaids," is proof that property was bought.

"We must be careful how we understand the terms "bought and sold" in the scriptures. Excepting the priests, Joseph "bought" *all the Egyptians*, and they sold themselves unto him. See Gen. xlvi. 19 and 23. They were bought for servants. "Were they therefore Joseph's "goods and chattels?" like the Southern slaves? "Jacob bought his two wives, for they say themselves of their father, "He hath sold us," Gen. xxi. 15. Were they therefore his slaves? Mere goods and chattels? Boaz bought Ruth. Was she a slave? To "buy with money" does not always mean to purchase property in scripture phraseology. See Ex. xxx. 12, and xiii. 13, 14, 15. "Redeem the first born," literally "buy" the first born. Cain signifies to "buy." Eve said "I have gotten," literally "bought," a man of the Lord, Gen. iv. 1. So according to slaveholders' logic, Eve was the first slaveholder—good old mother Eve; and the Lord the first slave trader. When our Southern slaveholders undertake to show how ancient their system is, let them go to the bottom. The Lord a slave trader! Eve a slave buyer! Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, good old slaveholders! &c. and so on. Who can doubt, but that slaveholders are of the patriarchal line!! Doubtless they are the *people*, and we poor *fanatics* ought to be expelled from the church, for not "walking in the steps of those good faithful ones of old!!!!" This term, shall "buy" your bondmen and bondmaids," so far from proving that *slaves* were thus obtained, supports a directly contrary opinion, and fully reveals the fact that the principles of common honesty were sustained in obtaining servants, as we shall just now show. It will be granted that the "strangers and their children which do sojourn among you," spoken of in the text, must have been free. The very term "sojourn" indicates this characteristic, as it means "to dwell for a short time in a place" while traveling. These were persons from whom it was appointed to the Jews to "buy" their "bondmen and bondmaids." Now the Israelites, as has already been seen, were forbidden from oppressing the "stranger," and therefore God commands them to "buy" bondmen of them. Mark the force of the expression, "of them shall ye *buy*," not steal, your bondmen. Ye shall not oppress them, ye shall "buy." Not compel them to an unwilling service, (as southerners generally do) ye shall "buy." Ye shall not *enslave*, forcing them into bondage, ye "shall buy" your servants justly. Shall not sunder the family ties, without consent of parents and children. Ye "shall buy" of them on fair contract. Any thing short of this would be grievous oppression; and so deeply concerned was the God of all goodness, for the welfare of the stranger, that he utters that thrilling denunciation against those who would dare oppress them, "If they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear, and my wrath shall wax hot against you, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows and your children fatherless," Ex. xxii. 22, 23, 24. So much for "buy" and sell. Our second position that the Jews could not hold men as property at all, much less establish everlasting slavery, being established; we pass to notice, thirdly, heirs

could not claim services from servants of legators, except upon positive contracts limited by the Jubilee.

Our opponents say children were to have the servants of their parents for an inheritance. We answer, heirs would of course claim the fulfillment of contracts with their parents. Justice would require this, because those services would be a part of the estate, "his money." But these words, "and ye shall take them for an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession," mean any thing else as soon as that slavery was to be perpetual among the Hebrews. An "inheritance," 'tis true, generally means a legacy from a friend, and a possession is commonly applied to property; but not always, by any means. Instance—He who drinks much rum, inherits disgrace and an early death, as his "possession;" but the sober man has an "inheritance" of long life with honor, as his "possession." These terms may express in a lively and forcible manner, certain privileges. Thus, the "inheritance" of Christ's humble followers will be a "possession" in the skies incorruptible. As "bondmen" would be a necessary part of community, the children of Israel were "forever" to have the privilege of "possession" by "buying" them of the "heathen and stranger," and this was to be their "inheritance." I know not what language could have portrayed more awfully than that we have quoted, the fixed determination of the Almighty, to blast and wither, with his fierce vengeance, the Jewish nation, if they should forcibly take the innocent "stranger or heathen" as property for an inheritance and "possession" for their children after them, and will them as *slaves* to their heirs "forever," for surely there can be no greater oppression, than that of enslaving a man. See Ex. i. 13, 14, and iii. 9. Every other wrong dwindles into insignificance when compared with this. Give me liberty or give me death, said Patrick Henry. Ten thousand voices echoed, "Give me liberty or give me death." 'Twas a noble saying. It rolled with gathering force through the nation, until the voice of one man was the thundering proclamation of millions, and was hurled, with defiance, at European despots on the eastern shore of the Atlantic. It lit up the fire of the revolution, which disenthralled us from a foreign yoke, and is destined to burn in the bosom of all the real friends of liberty, until "every yoke shall be broken," and all the "oppressed" upon the American continent go free. O thou Lord God of the oppressed! speed that day.

But once more. The Jews could not have understood the terms "inheritance and possession" as we understand them, when applied to property, for with all the claims of our opponents to perpetuity, when speaking of *Jewish slavery!* there was a law, (well understood by them) broad in its extent, positive in its requirements, plain in its phraseology, which shouted liberty upon every hill, rung it through every valley of the holy land, and in the twinkling of an eye removed every restraint that the master could legally fix upon the "servants and bondmen." What kind of property is that which owns itself fully at short intervals? What perpetuity! that which is periodical and numbers forty nine years!!! Every case of servitude was begun upon a

mutual agreement, and *must* close on the return of the Jubilee. Hebrew servants! heathen bondmen, strangers at service, "*all the inhabitants of the land*," partook of the general release: every bond was broken, and if any were oppressed, they all went free. This is all the individual "inheritance and possession" that the *children!* could possibly have in the bones and sinews of the poor *heathen slaves!*

Again: Speaking of our Saviour, the apostle says, "by whom and for whom were all things created," and again, "who made all things for his own pleasure." Could it be pleasure for the merciful Jesus, to see his redeemed rendering an unrequited and unwilling service to a tyrant? Common sense says no. And let all the righteous say amen. This leads us to consider and prove,

4. Jewish servants were in the main treated as equals or children, not a shadow of authority appearing in the word of God, for treating them as are our Southern slaves.

1. Their service was always voluntary—unless convicted of crime. This is indubitable from the following text, before quoted, Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, "Thou shalt not deliver to his master the servant, which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee *among you*\* in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates which liketh him best; thou shall not oppress him." Unsurl to the States, a banner with this inscription, and *slavery is dead.* The land would be darkened with flying thousands, who long to escape from their masters.

2. They might hold property over which the master had no control. For the counterpart of this, see the Southern slave codes generally.

3. They had the civil rights of citizens in the congregation of Israel. Southern slaves have none.

4. If the master smote out an eye or a tooth, freedom was the price. How is it south? Death is almost the only emancipator there.

5. The various public feasts, sabbaths, convocations, &c. gave Jewish servants rest for very near one half of the time.

How much rest, how many feasts and sabbaths, have Southern slaves?

6. Jewish servants sometimes married their masters children!

7. It was the duty of Hebrews to teach the law of God to their families.

Is this made the duty of masters in the South, by law? No. In some of the slave States, laws are made against this in effect.

8. Husbands and wives could not be forcibly separated under the Jewish law.

It is done daily in the South.

9. Jewish servants worshipped in common, in the same church with their masters.

*This is not even permitted in the North generally, much less in the South.*

We here insert an article, from the pen of Rev. George Storrs, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, upon the patriarchal treatment of servants.

\* In reading this, I fancy I hear a colonizationist exclaim, *horrible!* right among them! What amalgamators!

"Abraham had servants bought with money." "We find one an heir to his estate; see Gen. xv. 3. Another ruled over all that Abraham had, Gen. xxiv. 1, 2, sent to choose a wife for Isaac, v. 4. He seems to have had charge of Isaac himself, v. 6. Rachel salutes him with "my lord," v. 18. What a lovely slave! He inquires for a place to lodge in her father's house, v. 23. What a saucy slave! Ask for a place to lodge in a planter's house! Why not go to the 'negro quarters?' When our slave holders can show us, if they were to die childless, their slaves (goods and chattels) would be heirs to their estates; that they send them to choose wives for their sons; that they rule over all they have, &c.; then it will be time for us to grant that they have Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, for their examples." The treatment of minors, was that of children—and adults that of equals.

Objections of various kinds have been made to the idea just thrown out; some arising from one text, some another. We notice two of the strongest, and assure the reader, that quite as signal a refutation is the destiny of all others, as he will perceive happens to these. It is said that Hebrews might treat their servants with a rigor more severe than would be justifiable to their children. This idea arises from the closing clause of the text, "but over your brethren the *children of Israel* ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigor." And how does this apply to the "stranger" or the "heathen?" Personal treatment is not intended at all, but it was designed to add weight to the already implied injunction, to buy their "bondmen" exclusively from heathen and strangers. Another objection is taken from Ex. xxi. 20, 21. "If a man smite his servant or his maid with a *rod*, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished, (or avenged,) notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, (or avenged) for he is his money." This law is quoted to build up the idea of the existence of *slavery* among the Jews; and indeed to hold out a still more barbarous principle, viz: because the servant is called "his money" he had a right, *uncondemned*, to flog his slave to any extent, even to death, so that it did not occur during the infliction of the punishment.

Even Southern slave laws are more merciful than the *Jewish slave code*, according to this interpretation. It is horrible. But instead of authorizing cruelty, this regulation is perfectly just, and would doubtless be *the very rule of action, in our own Courts of Justice*, if a master should use the *rod* so severely upon one of his "servants" or "bondmaids" (apprentices,) as to produce death. It was applicable to Hebrew as well as Gentile servants; indeed, our translators being the judges, it was *positively confined to Hebrew servants*, for they call heathen servants "bondmen and bondmaids"—and how will it comport (according to the exposition of our opponents) with, "over your brethren the *children of Israel* ye shall not rule one over another with *rigor*?" Let the wicked have his own way and he will surely destroy himself. Let the pro-slavery advocates have their own way, and they make God say on one page of the bible, "over your brother Hebrew you shall not rule with rigor," and on the very next, "you may flog him to any extent you please, so that he does not die instantly, for he is your

money." O shame! cover them quickly. There is indeed no more authority for whipping a servant, developed in this passage, than masters have and of right ought to have, all over the world. The rod must sometimes be used on refractory young servants and children, both male and female, and this law was made to *guard the persons of Jewish servants against the abuse* of this practice, instead of authorizing masters to whip severely. "He is his money." In the very same sense are apprentices "the money" of masters now; and this phrase is used to show that *interest* was *added* in this case to other motives for preserving both the life and bodily powers of the servant. If the servant died under the *rod*, the master lost his life, (Ex. xxi. 12;) but if he lived "a few days" (for this is the meaning of the original translated "a day or two") it was possible some other cause produced the catastrophe, and life is so valuable that it should not be taken unless upon indisputable evidence of actual and *premeditated* murder. "Malice aforethought" is our legal term, and it was doubtless drawn from Ex. xxi. 12, 13, 14. The Lord prefers reserving a decision in such dubious cases, for his own management, or day of final accounts and judgment, when unerring scrutiny will do right. It is better that two guilty persons should escape human justice, than that one innocent, should be punished.

Three things described in this law, form an important reason, for sparing the life of the master. Taken together, they produce strong presumptive evidence, that he did not design to take the life of his servant.

1. The instrument used is not a deadly one—a rod.
2. The continuance of life, for some days.
3. The pecuniary interest, which he had in the labors of the deceased.

Another objection is, the Hebrew *six year slaves*, were stiled "servants," while the heathen, "*forever*" *slaves*, were called "bondmen." Let it be offered in any shape, it is of no force at all, for *the original of servants and bondmen, is every where precisely the same*; the variation is only an arbitrary arrangement of the translators. Every Hebrew scholar knows this is true. The design of the translators was to keep up a distinction, between Hebrew and heathen servants, which really existed. What that difference was, we are not told; but we conjecture, from a collation of various passages, referring to this subject, that it was in the length of time, for which they might serve, or in the kind of labor to be performed—probably both. Whatever it was, we are assured it involved neither oppression nor injustice, for the rule was established by one, who hateth perversion of judgment. The distinction between Hebrew and other servants, is developed as strongly in Lev. xxv. 39, 40, as in any other passage.

*Common translation.*

“And if thy brother, that dwelleth by thee, be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant ; but as a hired servant, and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee.”

*Literal translation.*

And if thy brother by thee, be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve with the service of a servant ; as a hired servant, as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee.

Even the tenth commandment of the Decalogue has been charged with supporting the pro-slavery opinion of the bible, in our presence, *by a minister of the gospel!!* It is, however, too puerile and wicked an objection, to notice farther, than to say, if coveting a servant, there means coveting property, coveting another's wife, does also.

Both are false in fact. Noah's curse of Canaan, has often been quoted, to prove the enslavement of Africans to be in accordance with prophecy ! and therefore right ! It is as absurd as wicked. Those of the American slaves, who have escaped the discoloring tinges of Southern amalgamators, are the descendants of Mizraim, Cush and Phut, who settled in Africa, while Canaan settled in Palestine. This is universally known to be true, being the combined testimony of biblical critics and commentators. To satisfy the reader as to the residence of Canaan's descendants, I refer to Genesis, x. 15 to 19, and Joshua, ix. 1. Abraham is cited as an example of slaveholding. “He had servants bought with money.” This is true. But if they were slaves, and would be the property of his legal heirs, how comes it, that one of them is said to be his heir, and would of course, own all the rest of the slaves ! Again: if they were slaves, where had they all gone to (1800 or 2000 of them) when Jacob, his lineal descendant and heir, went into Egypt, a few years afterwards. Not one of them was left, of all that number. Objections against the construction, which abolitionists put upon the bible, may be urged in great number ; but the grand cause of them all, is about here. The Pope issued his bill, some hundreds of years since, announcing the strict morality of the slave trade. Since that, slavery has prevailed extensively in Great Britain, France and America, as well as many other powers, with which we are commercially connected, and has produced wide spread, deep seated, and almost unconvertible pro-slavery prejudices. The nations involved in the sin, have “screwed to the sticking point” God's holy word, to calm the throes of disturbed consciences.

And yet the very men, who fly to the bible now, to prove slavery right, are compelled to turn upon themselves, and in one breath say, “*God did sanction slavery among the Jews,*” but “*we are as much opposed to slavery as any body else.*” This is truly one work of supererogation, if slavery was ever right, and God does not require it of them. We advise them, therefore, as men, to avow their principles, and advocate the perpetuity of American slavery ; the abolition of which, say they, will be attended with untold and unimaginable horrors throughout the land. The truth is, if *slavery was ever* morally right,

it is *now*; for we fearlessly assert, that no purer morality is inculcated in the bible, than we find developed in the Decalogue.

And now, we believe it a cheering truth, that, although very many good and great men have fallen into the snare set for them, by the enemies of liberty, and advocates for despotism; and have plead for the rightful existence of slavery, under the Jewish dispensation, there was no such thing there; but a mild and healthful servitude, regulated by laws of the purest possible character, for they were Divine. Our proofs have been, the laws imposing death as the penalty of man stealing, and forbidding Hebrews from returning or delivering servants to masters, from whom they had escaped. The general laws against oppression and requiring mercy. The established treatment of servants. The establishment of the Jubilee giving liberty to all the inhabitants of the land, every fiftieth year, and the positive immorality of selling one's self, into perpetual slavery. These are from the old testament, and are palpable. If suffered to prevail in our highly favored country, they would chant, in solemn, but gladdening tones, the final requiem of American slavery, which *John Wesley* declares, "the vilest that ever saw the sun." Before passing from the old, to the new testament, we subjoin references, to a few passages, which the reader may examine, if he wishes.

1. Treatment of servants. Ex. xii. 43, &c.; xxi. 7, &c. 26, 27. Deut. vi. 6 to 9; xii. 11, 12; xvii. 18; xvi. 13, 14, 15; xv. 12, 13, 14; xxiii. 15, 16. 1 Samuel, ix. 22. Genesis, xv. 3; xxiv. 1, 2, 4, 6, 18, 23.

2. Oppression. Ex. iii. 9; xxii. 21; xxiii. 9. Judges, x. 12. Lev. xxv. 14, 17. Deut. xx. 14; xxvii. 7. 2 Kings, xiii. 4. Psalms, x. 18; xii. 5; lxii. 10; liv. 3; cxix. 1, 21. Prov. xxii. 22, 16; xiv. 31; xxviii. 3; iii. 31; xxviii. 16. Eccles. iv. 1; vii. 7. Isaiah, i. 10 to 20; xxxiii. 15; iii. 12; xiv. 4; li. 13; lviii. 6. Ezekiel, xviii. 7, 12, 16. Jeremiah, xxii. 3, 13; showing old testament kindness to the poor. A comparison, and we have done. The Hebrews were compelled to make brick for Pharaoh, and received, we suppose, about the same wages with Southern slaves. Though whipped, they were not sold to individuals, nor were their families dismembered. God called this oppression, Ex. iii. 9, and condemns oppression in more than a hundred places. Is American slavery as bad, as was Egyptian bondage? Yes, and much worse. Is it probable then, that he hated one and still loves the other? He either loves or hates American slavery. Which, reader, do you suppose? There can be but one answer. And now, which will you do, hate with God, or love with man? Even the purity of our blessed Saviour's ministration, has been assailed, by the unblushing advocates of slavery. I pray they may be forgiven, in consequence of their ignorance.

I. It is said, that, although slavery in its most awful form, prevailed under the Roman government, Christ and his apostles too, tacitly acknowledged the rectitude of the system, by admitting slave-holders into the church, and retaining them in that character, without censure. We answer to this—

1. It proves too much for our opponents. If Christ *sanctioned*

slavery, by remaining silent upon the subject, he sanctioned the laws, regulating the system, for there is not in the new testament, a word of condemnation for them. What were those laws? Two or three, were as follows. A slave was struck out of the list of moral agents, and consigned to that of brutes. A slave might, at any time, be killed by his master, without punishment. A slave might be sold twice, by the same master, before he could claim his freedom.

2. The fact that a practice is not condemned *by name*, is no reason at all that it is right. Under the argument of our opponents, the midnight gambler, and the sabbath breaker, may escape rebuke. The owners of theaters, the performers themselves, and those who waste their time and money, in nightly attendance upon these demoralizing representations, may still drink the "shed blood" and eat the "broken body" of the crucified Redeemer worthily !! Burglary, counterfeiting, forgery, horse racing and polygamy, are likewise passed by the Saviour and his apostles, without condemnation, except by implication. No christian, can justify any of these practices, on the ground that silence is preserved respecting them. *The iniquitous features of every leading vice are condemned, and among others, SLAVERY does not escape the fiery ordeal of the new testament morality.* The main characteristics of American slavery, are all made criminal by the new testament.

1. Slave laws allow the separation of man and wife, by the order of the master.

*N. T.* "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder, Matthew, xix. 6.

2. Slave laws forbid the slaves from worshipping God by themselves.

*N. T.* "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, Heb. x. 25.

3. Slave laws exact labor without wages, in millions of instances.

*N. T.* "The hire of the laborers which have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth," &c. James, v. 1 to 6.

4. Slave laws shut out the knowledge of letters from the mind of the slave.

*N. T.* Search the scriptures.

5. Southern slavery encourages the stealing of men on the coast of Africa; for though prohibited by the laws of the land, they are still smuggled in.

*N. T.* "The law was made for murderers, men-slayers, *men-stealers*," &c. (alluding to Ex. xxi. 16.) classing them among the vilest criminals of the earth.

6. Slave laws in North Carolina, make it penal, to give or sell a slave any book, even the bible ! In Georgia and Louisiana, a *free black* may be fined, whipped, imprisoned, and in the latter State, even put to death, for instructing his own children to read the pathway to eternal life !!

*N. T.* "Wo unto you lawyers ! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge," Luke, xi. 52. "Ye fathers bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," Ephesians, vi. 4.

7. The new testament condemns the selling of one's self into slavery,

much more, one man selling another. "Ye are not your own: ye are bought."

8. It is the testimony of all candid slave-holders, and we positively know from the very nature of things, that slavery encourages general licentiousness.

*N. T.* In many places condemns adultery and fornication.

The slave laws of *Ohio*, and the constitution of the United States, allow slaveholders to carry freemen in irons to the South.

While the writer was engaged in preparing this pamphlet, two poor slaves passed through the village of Mansfield, (his residence) in chains! to slavery. They had escaped from their "better condition!" at Cincinnati, while passing down the river, to the Southern market, and in endeavoring to let their wives know where they were, the owner! (O! how can I write owner?) according to this *biblical!* American system, learned their place of residence, and sent the soul catchers for them. They found the slaves in their "*more miserable*" condition, comfortable in freedom. They were unwilling to permit the poor fellows to suffer under such a burthen as freedom, and therefore, swore they were slaves, and carried them back to their master; destined doubtless to cruel and unrequited toil, till death shall emancipate them. This is the tender mercy of American slavery! Oh my country! how long can God withhold his anger and fierce vengeance? I have since learned that one of the men engaged in taking them, was the landlord of the Stage house, in *Gratiot, Muskingum county*, Mr Price. A degenerate adopted son of *Ohio*, whose name should be cast out as vile.

*N. T.* Do unto others, as you would that others should do unto you.

These are a few of the points in which American slavery, bids defiance to the Almighty. They are the necessary consequences, the almost universal fruits, of established slavery every where. Other courses of treatment are exceptions. They are all pointedly condemned in the new testament. And is any one now prepared to say slavery is not touched by the Saviour's and apostles instructions? We have studiously avoided allusion to cruel treatment of the *persons* of slaves. The *system* is sufficiently horrible, to every well instructed mind, without any appeal to sympathy.

Many attempts have been made to sustain the morality of slavery, from instructions given to servants in the new testament. There is not, however, a single passage, which may not, with perfect propriety, be addressed to servants and *slaves* too, without sanctioning slavery in the remotest degree. Every attempt of the kind has been met and foiled a thousand times unansweredly.

If those who brought the first slaves into *Virginia* were guilty, were not those who purchased them also guilty? And how are those, who have since advocated and supported the system less guilty?\* Human

---

\* Wm. Pinckney said of American Slavery, in the Maryland House of Delegates, 1789, "Founded in a disgraceful traffick, its continuance is as shameful as its origin. Eternal infamy awaits the abandoned miscreants, whose selfish souls

laws generally recognize the principle, that aiders and abettors in crime are obnoxious to the punishment of the offended power. Why not apply the rule to the case under consideration? There is no reason, but that we will not. American slavery is enormously criminal, sinful in the pure light of the bible, and the way to get rid of it is clearly pointed out in that good book. "Cease to do evil." "Times of ignorance God winked at, but now calleth on all men every where to repent;" with many other passages urging immediate repentance for every sin, and declaring that the "wrath of God abideth on the children of disobedience." But stop not with forsaking sin; "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." Cease inflicting these wrongs—

By establishing the marriage ceremony among the blacks:

By paying them fair wages for their labor:

By protecting them in their personal and religious rights:

By securing to the females personal chastity:

By giving back to them the key of knowledge:

By allowing them to manage their own earnings:

By sending them the gospel in its fullness and purity:

By building them churches and school houses:

By supplying the South with ministers and teachers:

By treating them as having immortal souls:

By enlisting in their behalf, the piety and benevolence of the nation, that their character may emerge from that mental and moral night, in the "gross darkness" of which they have so long eked out a miserable existence, to reap in millions of instances eternal wo.

And now at the close of our effort, we may candidly say, that after the most careful investigation of Divine Writ, we rise from that perusal and research, refreshed and encouraged with a redoubled assurance, that the most inveterate and determined pro-slavery inquisitor cannot make out, from the bible, a single case of genuine slavery—that the servitude sanctioned by the word of God, was similar to that of foreigners, voluntarily sold for a limited period, to pay an honest debt, contracted for their benefit, in emigrating to this country—to our apprenticeship system—and to that of one nation leniently tributary to another—founded upon principles of pure morality and equal justice. No man in his senses, can claim this for American slavery. God's law knew no invidious distinctions of caste, wealth or condition, brought all in spirit and in truth to the common standard of equal partakers in the temporal benefits conferred upon the chosen descendants

---

should ever tempt them to rob unhappy Africa of her sons. But why should we confine the edge of our censure to our ancestors, or those from whom they purchased? Are not we equally guilty? They strewed the seeds of slavery around, we cherish and sustain the growth." Said Patrick Henry, "Is it not amazing, that at a time when the rights of humanity are defined with precision, in a country above all others fond of liberty; that in such an age and in such a country, we find men, professing a religion the most humane and gentle, adopting a principle as repugnant to humanity, as it is *inconsistent with the bible* and destructive to Liberty?"

of Israel—endowed both servant and master, “circumcised in the flesh,” with the same title to the land of promise on earth—and pointed all truly “circumsised in heart and life” to the same heavenly inheritance, with the blessed Redeemer, into whose body “by one spirit, are we all baptized,” whether black or white, bond or free.

To that glorious “home eternal,” where there is neither “Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female,” but “all are one in Christ Jesus,” I hope to attain, fully expecting to meet many colored saints “martyrs to the glorious cause” of “pure and undefiled religion,” not only mine equals, but greatly my superiors in celestial knowledge and heavenly growth into our “living head.” Though *whites will be in an immeasurable minority*, all will be equal; for prejudices of caste will be done away, glory shall crown all and “God be ALL in ALL.”

The only prayer which I can utter in reference to this momentous question is, that this nation may speedily resolve to keep that fast, which the Lord loves, described by Isaiah, chap. lviii. as follows. “Loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and break every yoke. Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house.” “When thou seest the naked to cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh.” And as God declares “all things shall work together for good to them that love” him, I am fully persuaded that such a happy triumph of right over wrong, as the abolition of slavery would be, cannot but secure to this people the glorious consummation of blessings described in the following verses of the same chapter in Isaiah. “Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward. Then shalt thou call, and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry, and he shall say, here am I. If thou take away from the midst of thee the yoke, the putting forth of the finger and speaking vanity, and if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noon day. And the Lord shall guide thee continually, and satisfy thy soul in drought; and thou shall be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not.”

And to aid in the accomplishment of this most desirable end, it becomes every follower of Jesus, to pursue the path directed by the prophet: “Cry aloud and spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins;” accompanying the cry with a warning of the fierce wrath of God against the oppressor, and an invitation to all to “return to the Lord, who will have mercy, and to our God who will abundantly pardon.”

## S U P P L E M E N T .

Negroes are human beings, because we can show their genealogy from Ham, see Acts, xvii. 26.

Our duty in reference to them. Hebrews, xiii. 3. John, xv. 12. James, ii. 8, 9. Isaiah, lviii. 1. Ephesians, v. 4. Ps. lxxxii. 3, 4. 1 John, iii. 17. Acts, xx. 26, 27.

They will pray for deliverance from oppression, and the Lord will hear. Ps. ix. 9, 18; x. 17, 18; xii. 5; lxxii. 12, 14; and cxl. 12. Prov. xxii. 23. Jer. lix. 15.

Oppression is forbidden. Deut. xxiv. 14, 15. Ex. xxiii. 9. Prov. xxii. 22. Zech. vii. 9, 10. Jer. xxxiv. 17. Ezek. xxii. 29. Prov. xiv. 31. Isaiah, v. 7. Amos, ii. 6.

There is danger in oppressing our fellow men. Ps. ciii. 6; cv. 25, 36. Ex. xxii. 21, 22, 23, 24. Prov. xxii. 16, 23. Zech. vii. 13, 14. Mal. iii. 5. Isaiah, i. 20. Jer. xxxiv. 20, 22. Ezek. xviii. 12, 13; and xxii. 31. Deut. xxvii. 19. Isaiah, v. 20, 23; and x. 1, 2.

Duty of repentance. Isaiah, i. 16, 17; lviii. 6, 7. Prov. xxix. 7; xxxi. 8, 9. Dan. iv. 27. Prov. xvi. 8. Micah, vi. 8. Ex. x. 3.

Safety in doing justice to the oppressed. Isaiah, i. 19; xxxiii. 15, 16; lvii. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. Ezek. xviii. 7, 9, 31, 32. Prov. xvi. 17, 19. Isaiah, xxxii. 17. Ps. lxxxiv. 11, 12. Rom. viii. 28. Ps. xxxvii. 3.

Applicable to American slavery. Ex. xxii. 29; and xxvii. 13. Eccles. iv. 1. Ps. i. 18. Job, xxxv. 9.

*Query.* Why is it, that in the whole history of Jewish servitude, we read constantly of buying, but never of selling in one single instance?

*Answer.* Servants sold themselves, and there never was a third person known in the transaction.